

W.H. Tengpart

FOREVER

Federal Bureau of Investigation
Attn: Cleveland Field Office
1501 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114



James E. Hester
N/A Agent
Email Address: jahesters@gmail.com
February 11, 2020

Federal Bureau of Investigation
1501 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

On 01012020, I reported portions of the attached information via the FBI's online tip form. I selected "Ohio" for region. Limitations of content precluded report as thoroughly intended. Therefore, I am, hereby, corresponding to report full intent in letter by mail.

Sincerely,

James E. Hester
James E. Hester, Fise, Jr.
FBI, Cleveland

INFORMATION

I am reporting crimes: Criminal Tampering, Destroying Evidence, Conspiracy to Commit Unconstitutional Infractions, various heinous crimes of Disobeying Court's Process and all types of Crim. I am certain that same acts are retaliatory-malicious toward this innocent, potential witness. These correspond with Stark County Court of Common Pleas Clerk Fema Pieleggi.

FemaPieleggi@starkcountyohe.gov
To Me
Date 1/15/2020 11:45 AM

I would like you to do the following: Please make a copy of the sheet with someone's name on it. I did photocopy it and enclose it for you.
Fema Pieleggi
Subject Name
Case No.: 2003DR00063
From Me

To FemaPieleggi@starkcountyohe.gov
Date 1/15/2020 9:46 AM

Thank you for your response. I appreciate the query report of case numbers associated with same name as mine. It was helpful toward my objective since "Personal papers and effects have been illegally seized and stolen by conspirators colluding in misconduct." I need to identify specific case pertinent for recovery of my personal records. Could you please inform by reply of which cases, if either 2001JCV118341, 2001JCR130041, 2003DR00063 or 2003JG011286 also involved one Marie Brosky or Marie Beaver as party? Thank you.

From: Fema Pieleggi
FemaPieleggi@starkcountyohe.gov
To Me
Date 1/15/2020 7:20 AM

Mr. Johnson only applies to the CP and JCV cases. CP cases are public record and your case (2003DR00063) does not refer to Marie Brosky or Marie Beaver. As to the JCV case (2001JCV118341), its not public record so cannot give you any information. If you are in town, please come in with your picture ID and we will give you any info you want. If you are out of town, please make a copy of your driver's license and have it notarized and send it to us with your request. As to the other cases:

2001JCV118341 - Call the Juvenile Criminal Department at (330)-451-7757
2003DR00063 - Call the Civil Department at (330)-451-7795

From: Me
To FemaPieleggi@starkcountyohe.gov
Date 1/15/2020 7:25 PM

I am certain, along my life, that there was a CP case pending 1989 through 2004 approximately. Marie Brosky was born. During, her name changed to Beaver. It involved custody of one James E. Norton. The others are her juvenile delinquency cases while in custody of the former and an African-American foster family who harassed me for non-entitled child-support. What is the number of his custody case requested? Also, please provide by reply summary information of 2007J030022.

If the case described with my request does not exist, there consciousness has been criminal record tampering and destruction. Do have proof of organized crime exists. It has been a recurring problem in my matters from these organized criminals colluding with infiltrated.

What is this number? What is 2007J030022, a separate case about? - expect obligatory answer!

From: Cathy Alter
CMAlter@starkcountyohe.gov
To Me
Date 01/09/2020 7:51 AM

Any questions regarding this case please contact Stark County Family Court (2007J030022). Any further questions you can contact me at 330-451-7792. Thank you, Cathy

From: Fema Pieleggi
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2020 10:41 AM
To: Cathy Alter
Subject: FW: Searching James E. Norton
Cathy,

Please read all of the emails. He sent the latest one and I don't know what to answer. Thank you, Fema
On Thu, Jan 2, 2020, 7:23 AM Fema Pieleggi <fpieleggi@starkcountyohe.gov> wrote:
(Pieleggi sent by reply above emails to Cathy Alter.)

From: Me
To: CMAlter@starkcountyohe.gov
Date 01/09/2020 9:59 PM

Hello,
I have been redirected with my inquiries. For clarity, do you work for the Stark County Court of Common Pleas? A search of its website was without results. If so, what job description do you have?

In my situation communications need to be by email. I am extremely time-consumed by various malicious, procedural harassments and obstructions. It is not practical to attempt phone calls. Email is available for efficient, convenient correspondence in matters.

From: Cathy Alter
CMAlter@starkcountyohe.gov
To: Me
Date 01/10/2020 6:56 AM

Yes, I work for Stark County Clerk of Courts, family court division. [Concluded]

Below is content of a Petition for Writ of Mandate prejudiced by District Court of California. Subsequently, the Supreme Court procedurally defaulted (criminally) on challenging Petition for Writ of Review denying its delivery. I have postal tracking proof that it was delivered.

By my experiences, I have reason to know that some of these involved conspirators are members of an "Attorney Unit" criminally colluding, ex parte with all public official parties coercing themselves on these matters interstate. This anomalous "Attorney Unit" is mentioned within

Content cited from said petitions

INTHE COURTOF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT Superior Court No 15-6705 13-3628 13-23865, 14-1219 Court of Appeal No PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE AND MOTION TO JOIN DUE CAUSES FOR EXTRAORDINARY RELIEF TOP RESID- ING JUDGE OF THE COURT OF APPEAL THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF YOLO THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT
WHEREFORE, here comes Petitioner James E. Horton moving this Court to 1 immediately stay all proceedings in primary case issue case 15-6705, until further order of this Court of Appeal, 2 issue a peremptory writ of mandate commanding Respondent Court to overturn conviction upon misthal and wrongfull verdict and dismiss charge because of denial of Petitioner's fundamental rights to Speedy Trial and Due Process.

cess 3 Joiner all other cases named herein as causes for Extraordinary Remedy together with primary case immediately stay all proceedings for each and issue its peremptory writ of mandate commanding Respondent Court to dismiss all other respective charges (13-3628, 13-23865, and 14-1219) and to terminate all prosecutorial action against Petitioner with item #2 above and 4 Any such other relief as may be appropriate and just.

STATEMENT OF FACTS Three years and seven months ago, prosecutorial action (still pending) was initiated against Petitioner James E. Horton. Public Officials together have committed the following actions (both in court and out-of-court colluding)

* The first case (case: 13-3628) amongst Malicious series of Prosecutorial Harassments initiated 06242013 charging violation of Resisting Arrest. Immediately post arraignment, Public defender (Ron Howard) overzealously and inexplicably raised Unreasonable and Malicious Doubt of Petitioner's COMPETENCE TO STAND TRIAL during open pretrial conference. Howard based Doubt raised solely on police report without adequate consultation due per Fiduciary Duty respective to an Attorney's Oath. Furthermore, during same hearing, Public Defender requested to Fast Track? said case as he verbalized according as to local procedure invented as termed (at least at current time). Procedure (anomalous and arbitrary) was granted upon his request. It prejudiced fundamental Due Process Rights prima-facie; therefore, in response, Petitioner filed a Faretta motion raising issue of Substantial Conflict Irreconcilable due to Incompetent and Ineffective Counsel by the Public Defenders' Office. Court granted, upon second Faretta motion, Waiver of Counsel and Self-Representation on 02242014. Since Waiver of Counsel, Petitioner filed pretrial motions (timely and proper with full merit) defending that prosecution lacked probable cause upon a pretextual, malicious, false arrest. These were prejudicially denied. Court maliciously continued pursuing wrongful prosecution. Petitioner continued challenging prejudicial errors and denials yet case is still pending.

* Subsequent to this first arraignment, an overburdening series of actions began. Four additional frivolous charges initiated. At respective arraignments, Counsel was appointed for three of them (Cases: 13-23865, 14-1219 and 14-4497)

* During pendencies, appointed counsel orally motioned for another anomalous procedure for all these subsequent cases together which Judge Daniel Maguire agreed to and ordered. Said to be ?trailing? but not joindered, all cases versus Petitioner were made to be scheduled consecutively and concurrently on the docket. As a result, all hearings were scheduled for all cases simultaneously. Scheduled hearings, actually, were discriminatorily truncated with obstructionist effect. Throughout, Maguire continually prejudiced Petitioner's time for Due Process procedure to be heard on matters for even first case while others were postponed and said to be ?trailing? as aforementioned. Ironically abusing discretion, he rationalized claiming ?interest of the time of the court? with an ?overburdened docket? Contrarily, Petitioner continually argued court Maliciously discriminated against him when considering same basis...

* Subsequent case 13-23865 also initiated by the West Sacramento Police Department upon first contact on 10072013. Petitioner, on date, was charged with Illegal Scavenging... for taking one bottle from a garbage can. On 05092014, Petitioner appeared in Department 7 (of old court house in Woodland) of Criminal Court before Judge Maguire for hearing upon Motion to Dismiss in first case (13-3628). Suddenly, in open court, judge opened proceeding by presenting unexpectant Petitioner with the addition of this case to the Criminal Court docket. Judge called Public Defender Karen Soell (present for other cases on same day's docket), to the bench since appointed at pretrial conference in case numbered: 13-23865 on 04092014. Per incompetent, arbitrary request of said public defender, Respondent court grossly abused discretion granting invented procedure that Due Process for said case ?trail? case: 13-3628. Thereby, in effect, Due Process on subsequent case was postponed until completion of first case. Otherwise, court treated case as if joindered in error within minutes recorded, and yet severally, for each case. Counsel's request was without consent of Petitioner and without consultation. Consequently, procedure on it has thus far been totally neglected, then deprived? procrastinated on by public officials. Meanwhile, minutes for each proceeding are recorded severally for all case dockets simultaneously as scheduled concurrently (as if joindered without relevant nexus) and with inadequate time for oral hearing procedure imposed? gross procedural anomaly unjustifiable.

* Case: 14-1219 involves charge of a camping infraction... Facts of incident upon which citation was based include 1) Circumstantially... He sat under an overhang to escape rain (on said date) with unprotected case files and work product on his person. He informed the... Officer of these exculpatory facts during an investigatory stop. Still, the officer, irrespective of Totality of Circumstances, cited... frivolously. This case also was transferred in error to Department 7 of Criminal Court by anomalous procedure. Actually, (by malicious incompetence) two arraignments were set. As reflected by Minutes within Case summary report, an arraignment as scheduled aforesaid in Traffic Court for 03262014 was rescheduled (recorded in minutes to be ?vacated?), ex parte and out-of-court, to earlier date of 03242014 in Criminal Court, Department 7 (of old court house in Woodland) and ?Assigned to Judge Maguire.? Petitioner appeared on same date as scheduled for Trial Setting Conference in first case: 13-3628. He was suddenly presented unexpectedly with the addition of this case to the Criminal Court docket two days prior to its actual, original arraignment in Traffic Court. Petitioner was then spontaneously arraigned. He pled Not Guilty. Public Defender was appointed. At Pre-Trial Conference on 04292014, per request of Public Defender granted in error, said case was accrued to dockets of ?trailing? cases as aforementioned (contrary to Petitioner's stated desires for defense). Case is still pending, ?trailing? also neglected.

* Anomalous procedure motioned for aforesaid grossly prejudiced Petitioner prima-facie. By such gross abuses of discretion, Due Process has been grossly denied. Petitioner expressed contrary desires during very few, inadequate consultations with counsel. Furthermore, although cases subsequent were repeatedly vacated (unspoken) as ?trailing?, still records (Minute Sheets and Case Summary Reports) falsely reflect ?Matter Heard? for hearings in each severally. Thereby, cases have compounded together to Overburden simultaneously. Above also constitutes extreme Abuse of Legal Process violating petitioner's Speedy Trial and Fair Trial Rights. Repeatedly (both to counsel in meeting and in open court), he has raised discrepancy about these acts of Procedural Misconduct and Harassment. Continually, he has been prejudicially ignored on issue. Court has responded only incrementally more and more Malicious and Retaliatory.

* During pendencies, Court obligated Petitioner to attend total of 45 pretrial hearings and 3 days of 1 trial for which sentence hearing and judgement are delayed. The trial is not concluded. Hearings have resulted in a long train of blatant prejudicial denials flying in the face of Constitutional Rights.

* Since commencement, Petitioner successfully raised issues of substantial conflict due to ineffective counsel (completely adverse to adequate defense violating attorney-client privilege and Attorney's Oath) and right to waive counsel. Therefore, court granted right to self-represent in all case during oral hearing on 12072015 upon reasoning above herein. Need for competent counsel necessitated assertion of right? Petitioner is law trained.

A case 14-4497 initiated by Woodland Police Department alleging violation of PC 7.415(a). Facts are that a 14-year-old Petitioner by testifying in defense to Police Station retaliating against his intent to acquire a citizen's complaint form concerning prior misconduct, said case was dismissed upon violation by numerous times, in various ways, within pretrial motions to dismiss with merit. Petitioner has raised point detailed as follows: (RELEVANT TO PETITION TO FAIR TRIAL PRE JUDGED BY RESTRAINED OF LIBERTY TO AN AREA)

Present case primarily at issue 15-54705, initiated with a Malicious Arrest on 02/18/2015 in Woodland. A male citizen, an informant, was assaulted and during accuser's dispatch call, a false malicious report. Arrest was made away from scene of incident. Informant complaint alleged violations of law, charges PC 7.415(A), Arson/Murder Child and PC 7.415(b) Fighting. Arraignment was scheduled on 03/14/2015 at Incompetent Superior Court. Prior to arraignment aforementioned, Petitioner rejected said case for "lack of sufficient evidence". On date of rejection, attorney for defense, Mr. Bulkeley, informed Petitioner he learned of rejection by a hand-delivered letter, after was addressed to "Judge C" without reading or being presented with served motions. On 12/7/2015, however, at the readiness for first case, 15-5628, Judge Maguire opened hearing concerning a review of prior charges charging docket. Maguire set continuances for other prior cases per "Pending" procedure. Conspicuously failing, it is believed, to have been informed of legal procedure, with intent to Overburden Petitioner's Right to Fair Trial.

On 02/17/2016, Petitioner filed Common Law Motion to Dismiss Because of Denial of Right to Speedy Trial - due to excessive delay in trial to cause 15-6706, arguing: Bad-faith delay of nine and one half months, without showing of good cause, for arrest to arraignment, constituted unconstitutional denial of public officials' responsive to Prosecution's untimely disclosure of discovery, and in open court, during jury trial date on 02/17/2016, thereof, the defendant, "Incompetent" public officials has caused (another) two months of bad-faith delay? pursuant to PC ss 186.2. (Judge Maguire denied both motions on 03/23/2016. (Please refer to Appendix _____).

On 04/20/2016, Petitioner filed Petition for Writ of Mandate and Request for Stay of Trial proceedings. After deemed of "unreasonable Motion to Dismiss Due to Denial of Right to Speedy Trial, Due Process and Fair Trial and Notice of Motion to Dismiss Because of Denial of Right to Speedy Trial Regarding Charge of Violation of CAPC 415(1) arguing points: JUDGE PREJUDICIAL REFERRED BY MAILED LETTER TO R.A. (RE: 15-54705) ON 04/17/2016 AND DEFENDANT IS PRUDICED BY RESTRAINT OF LIBERTY TO AN AREA. As result, of that recklessness, witness is scheduled 04/21/2016 trial was vacated until 06/15/2016 for time in lieu of decision pending upon request for stay. (Prosecutor Fritz Van Der Hoek filed his opposition (05/10/2016) please refer to Appendix _____). Decision upon is still pending untimely delayed by Appellate Division of Respondent Court in full faith effect. Petitioner waited back multiple times seeking said decision. Court continually informed Petitioner that said Petition has been sent for scrutiny, such as, filed an Attorney's brief since 05/09/2016 being same date prosecution filed its opposition. Facts provided concerning status raise serious suspicions about ex parte "INCOMPETENT" contact with judge.

Actually, proceedings since 06/22/2016 constituted "Mistrial". At continued trial readiness on 06/22/2016, Petitioner again requested continuance (with showing of cause and merit) in lieu of inordinate, untimely delay (by Appellate Department) of decisions upon his motion for Writ of Mandate and Request for Stay. In response, Judge Maguire 1) vacated conference until 06/17/2016, 2) then ordered parties to file papers, and by vacated date of 06/17/2016) informing Appellate Department concerning delays as above. Thereby only less than two days were given for action, much per order with disregard for statutory procedure at issue (reasonable deadlines). On 06/17/2016, prior to hearing, Petitioner (being procedurally overburdened unfairly) filed an APPENDIX TO PETITION FOR MANDATE BRIEF addressing, as order, issue of said delays. (Please refer to Appendix _____). At continued hearing on 06/17/2016, Judge Maguire informed of denial of stay and set jury selection for 06/17/2016. Court pre-emptively denied his motions for mistrial. Petitioner (at least) twice orally moved for mistrial upon above facts, he motioned in vain, late in day, court (2pm), and then during evidentiary procedure hearing (06/22/2016). Judge reasoned, in part, that he only accepts motions in writing, not during oral argument proceedings.

Post further gross abuses of discretion occurring between 06/17/2016 and 06/29/2016, trial at lengthy proceeded on 06/22/2016. Several gross process violations occurred during trial. Just three examples are as follows:

During voir-dire selection on 06/23/2016, Supervisor of Woodland Police Department, as referee, (it was) detected in jury box, and presence of Officer (Agent of Party in Interest) evidenced intent to collude and conspire in acts of tampering, as well as, obstructing the jury. Insistence of an untrained jury.

During fact-trrying, prosecution based its case solely upon non corroborated, unsworn, oral testimony of an untrained, untrained (by prosecution) included:

1. Fabricated facts testified by informant as first witness ((being incompetent, irrelevant to charge, inconsistent and contradictory and thus challenged by Petitioner's motion to impeach on the record, and during cross-examination) (Black's Law Dictionary 409 Abridged 6th edition, 1971)).
2. Electronic audio recording of dispatch call ? the initial accusation ? reported by said first witness (which included audible background of Petitioner from a distance, orating about the false report while departing).
3. Second and last witness, Officer Guthrie of the Woodland Police Department testified that he did not witness incident at scene of complaint while further parol testimony only evidenced that Petitioner had departed scene of incident without Fighting.

Yet, jury reached wrongful verdict of ?guilty? and Petitioner was wrongfully convicted of violation of PC ss 415. Furthermore, trial, to this date, is still incomplete. Court is delaying sentencing, hence judgement, egregiously inordinate. Jury selection and verdict on 06/24/2016 has been last trial decision thus far. Judge, on same date, continued sentencing phase until 06/29/2016. Therefore, under such ?Extraordinary Circumstances? (specifically with respect to delayed sentencing and judgement in bad-faith), Petitioner, on 06/28/2016, filed Motion to Vacate Judgement arguing following headed points: CASE IS STILL PENDING INORDINATELY DELAYED DECISION ON (PETITIONER'S) PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE, and that FAIR TRIAL PRE JUDICILY HARMED BY UNDUE INFLUENCE UPON JURY. (Please refer to Appendix _____).

On 06/29/2016, at continued sentencing hearing, Maguire (conspicuously) retaliated maliciously against my most recent motion and with motive and intent to preemptively obstruct Post-Trial and succeeding causes for civil actions. On the record, the hearing was completely one-sided? Obstructionist Petitioner appeared prepared to argue in support and in defense on issues relevant to sentencing by statute. He attempted to raise and then asserted to raise them. Maguire blatantly denied Due Process precluding right to speak. Continually, he interrupted attempts to assert right for hearing on matter. Furthermore, he reversed accused Petitioner overbearingly insisting he not ?interrupt? Maguire also forbade right to state objections during an Unconstitutional, ex parte ?presentation? by the District Attorney's Office.

Court acted to unjustly Duress Petitioner to accept settlement offer for a nonstatutory, Unconstitutional alternate to sentencing. Judge opened with prosecution. A Christopher Bulkeley, Deputy District Attorney appeared present ? not prosecutor on record in the case and during trial (Fritz Van Der Hoek). Bulkeley gave improper, prepared presentation endorsing (on record) a newly conceived ?program? ? the ?Diversionary Homeless Program.? Accordingly, Petitioner would be Coerced to concede to Admission of Guilt, progress through stages of a thought-control program, accept ?Incompetent to Stand Trial? status and controlled, free housing for indefinite period of time (when I am not even native to this state or county). Since I rejected said offer stating it to be unconstitutional on the record, Maguire persisted to Maliciously Retaliate with Gross Abuse of Discretion. Bulkeley reiterated intent to Maliciously Raise Doubt about Competence to Stand Trial! Maguire threatened (even Blackmailed) with Prejudice in Sentencing Phase ? an excessive, maximum jail term (upon wrongful conviction while refusing to hear Petitioner on issues at hand for which he came prepared) as ultimatum to offer ? an alternate to

Date for case 15-6705 concurrently with case 14-1219 has been set for 02112017. ~~Amended date continues~~ Scheduling date for case 14-32385 originally with 13-23865 has been set, separated from others, for 02212017. Scheduling occurred as result of 2 separable false arrests upon false arrest warrants by Louisville Police Department on 11152016 and 11212016.

Petitioner holds issued warrants constituted gross abuses of discretion and made no efforts to comply with the following specific

1. Although absent in Respondent court on 08242016, Petitioner was circumstances unable to appear. He and his legal team were unable to serve Petitioner for Extraordinary Writ and while indigent, without adequate transportation and denied. 2. Petitioner requested stay of proceedings within Petition attachment. 3. Hearing date on 08242016 was set for multiplicity of matters in all cases simultaneously being continued since 7/27/2016. Considering police officials disrupted prosecution? trailing? procedure to harass Petitioner with multiplication of warrants and arrests upon single hearing. Petitioner was denied trial date originally or later postponed for sentencing and motion practice. Frivolous restraints disrupted his abilities to prepare and practice.

DEFENDANT'S RIGHTS TO FILE MOTION FOR REHEARING OR RECONSIDERATION

A total accumulation of four criminal matters have overbearingly inflicted by the State Attorney General's Office. Thereabout pre-enumerated by public officials in these matters is overbearing upon the Defendant a type of Procedural harassment that is bordering on *Annoying* depriving Defendant of liberty and, also, life in that his opportunities for employment are disrupted, associations such as family, affiliation, and service and reported jobs (notwithstanding isolation & deep-seated ostracization) by protracted, punitive, procedural surge in a foreign region. Consequently, unpermitted physical distance (Defendant must expend time-consuming effort toward life-sustaining activities while balancing deliberative exhaustive labor of Criminal defense trials again) & without incentive. Having, by necessity, to self-represent in such circumstances is depleting his resources, imposing impediments to considerate working conditions - regarding his ability to prepare for trial as a Fair Trial issue, inducing anxiety and inflicting distress reasonable to expect by reasonable person(s). Standard Furthermore, Defendant is forced by necessity to self-represent (in all four cases) due to severely substantial conflict with counsel being in an unfair conflict with agents of the state. The pivotal case on the federal question concerning definition of standards for determining competence to self-represent Indiana v. Edwards spawned contributory research and analysis at issue for application in the states. In *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law* & Psychiatrists Morris and Frierson published a clinical study on choice to exercise Right to Self Represent as a phenomenon wth analysis toward & professional guidelines related to forensic psychiatric practice & & limitations of the decision. The Defendant found article articulated in either California Jurisprudence or American Juris prudence or some similar secondary authority for research under the topic of Competence to Self-represent (contested wth 1st and 2nd Amendment 13 U.S. 922) and for his Faretta motion.

Amongst positive reasons for such choice, vindicated by these researchers, include: (♦) little trust in the fairness of the legal system, which is reasonable by believe that Fiduciary Interests of ♦public defenders♦ are compromised since ♦they are employees of the state♦. However, in Morris, MD, and the board in L. E.erson, MD, Pro Se Competence in the Aftermath of Indiana v. Edwards, 36 J Am Acad Psychiatry 561 (2001), it is argued such circumstances would constitute an unfair conflict between a Defendant and Agents of the State necessitating self-representation for any adequate defense. Temporarily if defendant is of adequate Defendant, and rationally by his experience, claims: evidence shows such a condition exists in this case pending his trial without pending self-representation; giving him a severely substantial conflict because of gross ineffective counsel by public defenders

According to Serna, ◆Right to speedy trial protects criminal defendant against oppressive pretrial incarceration, anxiety, harassment, and disruption of his everyday life◆ (Serna v Superior Court (1985) 40 C3d 236). Furthermore, this Court reasoned, quoting from U.S. v Marion: ◆Inordinate delay between arrest, indictment and trial may impair a defendant◆s ability to present an effective defense. But the major evils protracted against by the speedy trial guarantee exists quite apart from actual or possible prejudice to an accused◆s defense. To legally arrest and detain the Respondent trial absent probable cause to believe the arrestee has committed a crime. Arrest is a public act that may seriously interfere with a Petitioner◆s liberty whether he is free on bail or not, and that may disrupt his employment, drain his financial resources, curtail his associations, subject him to reputational harm, and create anxiety in him, his family and friends◆◆ (U.S. v Marion (1971) 404 US 307 as quoted in Serna v Superior Court (1985) 40 C3d 236). Proceeding on these actions would not serve justice, but only prejudice the Petitioner in that the delays are causing undue disruption to his life without justifiable cause. At time of arrest, he did not have outstanding warrants, nor a criminal record. Indigent, Petitioner is not resident to the area. He intends to move on and tend to important life matters, yet his liberty to move is restrained by violation of Speedy Trial Rights ◆ and without income ◆ in proceedings pending for total of over three and one-half years in Respondent Court. Finally, in lieu of above, Petitioner has already punitively suffered in excess of maximum sentence for all cases together in total by said restraints.

POINT IN SUPPORT OF JOINING CLAIMS FOR EXTRAORDINARY RELIEF

Petitioner's Fair Trial and Due Process Rights have been prejudiced prima-facie in each case by anomalous procedures ordered throughout all pendency together. All prosecutorial actions named herein (cases 13-3628, 1323865, 14-1219 and 15-6705) are connected together in same schema effecting accumulated Overburden unfairly constituting Abuse of Legal Process via Retaliatory and Malicious Prosecutorial and Procedural Harassment. They all have been initiated against Petitioner upon complaints by Real Party in Interest alleging charges. As Gross Abuses of Discretion by Respondent Court, they prove Conspiracy to Commit Infractions against Petitioner's Fundamental Rights amongst Agents of the State in Yolo County colluding

Pursuant to CCP § 1109, petition for Extraordinary Writ initiates a form of civil action and rules of procedure prescribed in CCP § 307-1062.20 apply. Pursuant to CCP § 427.10), a cross-complainant may join any causes of action he or she has against party making complaint against the same. The purpose of statutory provision for joinder is to permit joinder in one action of several causes arising out of related transactions and involving common issues. The statute should be liberally construed so as to permit joinder whenever possible in furtherance of this purpose. (Moe v. Anderson (2012) 207 Cal. App. 4th 826)

For purposes of this Petition for Extraordinary Writ, Petitioner is same as cross-complainant by definition. He possesses these multiple civil causes of action for relief with merit against same party being Real Party in Interest named herein. Therefore, it is in the interest of justice that this court joinder said cases as causes together and issue an peremptory writ ordering Respondent to dismiss in all cases and terminate all prosecutorial actions aforesaid.

COURT PREJUDICIALLY ERRED IN ORDERING WARRANT FOR ARREST CHARGING CONTEMPT OF COURT

At 1300 on 007272016, post gross denial of process during 1000 docket, presiding judge (Daniel Maguire) overzealously ordered warrant for arrest charging vindictively acts of malfeasance by Petitioner upon Prosecutor & his request ex parte. Judge prejudicially erred in granting order with motive to retaliate by act of vindictive Prosecution in a Conspiracy to Commit Constitutional violations.

On Wednesday 6/27/2015 at 1000, am Defendant self-representing, Petitioner arrived to appear for hearing upon motions at the Superior Court, Yolo County Courthouse 10. As previously mentioned, arbitrary procedure, hearing was upon 3 separate matters in 2 separate cases. By noon, Petitioner was blatantly denied

hearing although present. Judge called break for lunch at end of calendared docket session. He then, as recurrence amongst 47 hearings frequented by such prejudicial treatment, rationalized that my cases involve too many issues and take too long. Meanwhile, matters for others were heard dramatically longer than typical for Petitioner at bench. Omission constituted flagrant Due Process denial and Procedural Harassment. Improper, it caused excessive disruption to my day. I had other matters to tend to and for survival being discriminatorily delayed in court.

During scheduled session, a bailiff of the Sheriff's Department vindictively baited to entrap with discriminatory action in open court. Petitioner entered line to approach bench. Bailiff initiated to remove me from the courtroom unreasonably and imprudently. Off the record, as session concluded, Petitioner urgently communicated (as he was being removed) asserting his right for hearing without inordinate prejudicial delay effected. Judge silently ignored, left bench for lunchbreak without acknowledging issue.

Petitioner returned 1440 during afternoon docket for addressal of issue. During interim, he had tended to personal necessary matters not able to arrive at exactly 0130 when, circumstantially, court procedurally defaulted previous. Also, it is customary for counsel to arrive enter line during course of session to be heard. Same bailiff persisted enforcing that Petitioner remain outside courtroom and presented minute order recording. People request a warrant based upon Defendant's contempt/behavior in court. Petitioner requested callback. After Bailiff attempted further baiting with repeated, irrelevant, circular questioning and responses, he accommodated.

Judge called Petitioner to bench, then informed on record that he refused to hear him on date. Specific Deputy District Attorney was now absent, although others were then present. Matters were not continued. Judge imposed one minute for requested statement on the record and cut it short.

Petitioner's spoken words were not in themselves contemptuous nor uttered in an insolent or defiant manner. (Rose v. Superior Court in and for Los Angeles County (1934) 140 Cal. App. 418). He acted within right, in context, addressing blatant denial of Due Process as Constitutional Fundamental Right. His act possessed justifiable showing of cause necessary toward aggressive defense addressing distressingly expedient issue, especially factoring extraordinary circumstances resulting from prolonged pattern of Abuse of Legal Process harassing petitioner in a harmful manner (as above). His statement failed to warn before taking disciplinary action against (Petitioner) during ex parte proceeding subsequent with Prosecutor (Gallagher v. Municipal Court of City of Los Angeles (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 784; in re Buckley (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 237).

Petitioner did not persistently (interrupt) court proceedings (as) an attorney as to embarrass the administration of justice. (In re Hallmann (1932) 126 Cal. App. 121). Pro Se, he possessed the duty to protect (his) interests (as Defendant) and press legitimate argument and to protest an erroneous ruling which was, by omission, act obstructing justice by Due Process (In re Hallmann, Supra).

Here, summary contempt power must not stifle freedom of thought and speech so necessary to a fair trial under the adversary system. (In re Hallmann, Supra). The court must not unduly interfere with representation's obligation to vigorously represent interests of a Defendant apparent disrespect was objectively clear but the subjective impression of the judge. (DeGeorge v. Superior Court (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 305). Extraordinary Circumstance of Overburden in lieu of Abuses of Legal Process make it impracticable for Petitioner to file timely several motions at issue (such as Change of Venue, Disqualify Judge and Prosecutor) not several Petitions for each case. Therefore, it would be in the interest of justice for Court to order stay on all proceedings in all cases against Petitioner per requests and in joinder of causes. Doctrine of laches (in fairness) rules at issue.

James E. Horton, In Propria Persona

DECLARATION OF JAMES E. HORTON IN SUPPORT PURSUANT TO CA RULES OF COURT ♦ 8.486(3) IN LIEU OF NON POSSESSION OF PROPER TRANSCRIPTS

I, James E. Horton, as Defendant In Propria Persona, declare under penalty of perjury, on information and belief, under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct:

Whereas, on 06222016, Petitioner filed request for transcript of trial readiness conference on 06152016 with Court Reporter's Office at Respondent Court.

Whereas, on 06232016, Petitioner filed request for transcript of trial beginning 06222016.

Whereas, on trial date of 06242016, obviously responsive to requests filed aforesaid, court reporter, Lisa Schafer, approached Petitioner present in courtroom communicating transcripts would not ever be provided to him. She claimed: her manager informed her of policy accordingly, instructed her to inform petitioner of said policy based on grounds that a fee waiver was never ordered covering (when a fee waiver had been granted recorded in court file which Petitioner previously had received transcripts upon during pre-trial and when such delivery is at cost of the state in criminal proceedings by statute and relevant Judicial Council rules).

Whereas, on 06242016, petitioner filed application for fee waiver specifically for transcripts and Respondent filed order denying request on either 06252016 or 06272016 reasoning, judgement has not issued and no appeal is pending. Request may be re-submitted after entry of judgment. Judge dated order signed as

♦ June 25, 2016. Case Summary Report reflects Order denying Fee Waiver dated 06272016.

Whereas, on 06272016, Petitioner filed request for hearing about court fee waiver order, court set order to appeal order for 07272016 which was continued since Petitioner was denied procedure on said date.

Whereas on 07012016, Petitioner filed application for waiver specifying request for transcripts to attach to Petitions despite for appeal other proper motions for extraordinary relief.

Whereas, court has procedurally defaulted on ignoring Petitioner's application filed 07012016.

Whereas, Petitioner filed Request to Waive Additional Court Fees on 07152016 specifying transcripts were needed for Petitions and for Faretta motion, not appeal.

Whereas, on 07192016, judge, delaying request filed 07152016, ordered another fee waiver hearing date for 08242016 being same date set for continued sentencing, warrant review, hearing upon Faretta motion and multitude of other matters for all cases simultaneously as Procedural Harassment and Abuse of Legal Process. Thereby, despite Petitioner's full-faith and diligence to acquire proper transcripts, Respondent Court has denied delivery and they are unavailable for attachment...MOTION TO DISQUALIFY JUDGES

Petitioner, James E. Horton, Pro se, In forma pauperis, now comes attesting as follows:

Numerous contingencies of cases at issue to petition attached show, prima facie, that public officials at the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Yolo, respondent, possesses malice intent toward him and are hostile to his Fundamental Rights. They are clearly incapable of being impartial.

Respondent is harming said Petitioner's ability to prepare defense with unjust overburden by accumulative prosecutorial harassment, speedy trial and due process denials and infractions disrupting his life. Therefore, he lacks time for further research at issue for this motion.

Wherefore, Petitioner hereby moves this court, however, to issue its decision, mandate or order, upon whatever merits by applicable law are obvious prima facie, to disqualify all judges of said respondent court from hearing matters and adjudicating further in Petitioner's cases immediately with stay. Even if precedental, granting this motion serves the interest of justice when weighing presumptive issues...

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA James E. Horton Case No.: C08425 MOTION TO COMPEL RECORD AND TRANSCRIPTS NEEDED FOR REVIEW

Despite Petitioner's full-faith and diligence to acquire adequate record, Respondent Court has denied delivery and it is unavailable for attachment. (Please refer to Declaration ♦ IN SUPPORT PURSUANT TO CA RULES OF COURT ♦ 8.486(3) IN LIEU OF NON-POSSESSION OF PAPER TRANSCRIPTS attached as pg. 23 of Appendix A.) Petitioner has conveyed, to Appellate Court, intent to compel documents from lower court and Real Party in Interest subsequent to and upon

copy of his petition. Please refer to DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER TO FILE STAMPED HARDCOPIES TO APPENDIX D (b) (6) (C) (1) & (2) (b) (6) (D) (1) & (2) (b) (6) (E) (1) & (2) (b) (6) (F) (1) & (2) (b) (6) (G) (1) & (2) (b) (6) (H) (1) & (2) (b) (6) (I) & (2) (b) (6) (J) attached as pg. 22 of Appendix E; Respondent Court immediately dismissed improperly without allowing for the above. Transcripts and case-file records are mandatory pursuant to CA Rule of Court § R-606.

Furthermore, Petitioner avers experiencing degradation of trial delivery by post office in Solano County connected with court's evidentiary exclusion amongst public officials to commit regularly misconduct and run of court. Although no rule or statute mandates evidentiary facts from a witness placed this court to justify his/her status as possibility regarding a conspiracy to commit various familial violations causing Petitioner, defendant to be devoid of a reliable physical mailing address. Presently, prior to respondent judge, Mr. Justice's acquisition of position at the bench, he served as Hon. Judge in executive cabinet of Governor Schwarzenegger at the capitol of the state of California and possesses connections to congressional branch such as unreported damage. Therefore, the degradation delivery by attorney and transmission and void of any further procedural requirement (statutory or otherwise), open to attorney (as they would object due to his presumption right of access) serviced to his email address herein provided which he is able to receive even under extraordinary circumstances as previously planned. He desirably funds copies for his records for defense. Therefore, even if predecisional in the interest of justice procedurally, Petitioner hereby invokes this court for an order compelling respondent to deliver transcripts and case-file records. (Concluded).

Relevant Diary Records:

CARTONITES WHO HAVE CONFLICTED WITH ME

Atty Frank Fornione Unhelpful with my valid complaints with Marie in person (See Pg. 13, nearly judge of Discrepancy issue)

Atty Christine Johnson Convicted of fraud after acting as G.A.L.

Law Director Joseph Martuccio. Employment at Law Dept. He said "If you tell what goes on here, you'll close your kickbox during my interview. I assumed he was kidding.

Atty George Urban My law teacher at Brown Mackie. He told to me to go to my little agency in San Jose. I legal in my law school political about Robert and I you know will it was become.

Vice Squad When I reported about Marie.

Ex-management of American Rescue Workers (the Walkers and Larry Martin). That day in late 2008, they were asked for corruption. I spoke of my experiences.

Atty Morello He represented Marie.

Marie Brosky Assaults at the house and evidence from P.I.

Various people I have met at the YMCA since I moved in 1999. I did not run in the same breed of degeneration with drugs and prostitutes and so on. Many became hostile for this. I did not condone their ways although I treated them with dignity as human beings. They responded if I have to get the drugs from?

CARTON CHILDREN SERVICES Per Marie's report, they claimed that I "gave them so much attitude that they had to get the manager". I see this incident different by I feel I was treated with incredulity and discrimination as a non-custodial father. I was only persistent about my concerns. The predominantly female staff were consistently attitudinal and derogatory. I felt disrespected as a concerned parent.

CARTONITES WHO KNOW ME

Judge Michael Howard I was active as my own attorney during my Domestic cases. I attracted a lot of attention with my intervention in favor of family court. During my internship at the Law Dept.

Atty Jason Reeser I did work for him dealing with landlords. He acknowledges me on the street.

Atty Kathleen O' Tatarsky I drafted memorandum for her and organized her files.

Judge John Paulos I observed court room procedure under him during my externship. He acknowledges me on the street.

[Handwritten correction in law ~~SHADY SITE~~
that does not conform to paragraph 9
(Having conducted by ~~Shady Site~~)
surveillance in conspiracy to commit]

DECLARATION OF JAMES HORRIN IN SUPPORT PURSUANT TO CA RULES OF COURT § R-606 (b) (1) & (2) (b) (6) (C) (1) & (2) (b) (6) (D) (1) &
NOT-POSSESSION OF FILE-STAMPED HARDCOPIES TO APPENDIX

I, James E. Horrin, as Defendant, In Propria Personae, doles under penalty of perjury, all information and belief. It where, Petitioner, under Extraordinary Circumstances effected, do not possess attorney and hard-copies of relevant documents... as exhibits. It where, forced to sue, judge who only representing, Petitioner's cart of possessions including file box... was stolen on 07/2016... documents copies. It where, on some date, clerk informed I, physical case files are not available. Having been transferred, not present at the court, to an "Attorney Unit" while no information was available as to identity of this "Attorney Unit" or reason for action. Consequently, Court again mistakenly denied procedure...

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT

Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com.

Certified Mail Free

Extra Services & Fees - See back of book for more information

- Return Receipt with copy \$
- Return Receipt without copy \$
- Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$
- Adult Signature Required \$
- Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$

Postage

Total Postage and Fees

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

OH 44114-2114

Cleveland, OH 44114

PS Form 3800, April 2013 PSN 200-0200-0007

See Reverse for Instructions

Certified

U.S. Postal Service Certified Mail

\$3.55



U.S. Postal Service

GRAND RAPIDS MICHIGAN

POSTAGE PAID

100

100 | Page

Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law

Certified

07019280002012792864
Attached postage
Attached Amount 40

Total:

Text your tracking number to 2877 (2USPS) to get the latest status. Standard Message and Data rates may apply. You may also visit www.usps.com USPS Tracking or call 1-800-222-1811.

All sales final on stamps and postage
Thank you for your business.

Receipt #: 840-29560471-2-2795266-2
Clerk: CLERK2